1	MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612)
2	United States Attorney
3	MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630) Chief, Criminal Division
4	ANDREW M. SCOBLE (CABN 124940)
5	Assistant United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Ave., Box 36055 Son Francisco, California 04102
6	San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7200 Fax: (415) 436-7234
7	E-Mail: andrew.scoble@usdoj.gov
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
12	
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 12-0780 SI
14	Plaintiff,)
15	v.) [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING v.) TIME FROM OTHERWISE APPLICABLE
16) SPEEDY TRIAL ACT COMPUTATION, ANDRE BENARD,) FROM NOVEMBER 2, 2012 THROUGH
17	Defendant. December 7, 2012)
18 19	The parties appeared before the Court on November 2, 2012 for status on the pending
20	Amended Form 12 in CR 05-0400 SI. The defendant, Andre Benard, appeared in custody,
21	represented by Mark Goldrosen, Esq., and the government appeared through Assistant U.S.
22	Attorney Andrew M. Scoble.
23	At the November 2, 2012 hearing, the parties pointed out that this case – CR 12-0780 –
24	had been filed, and involved a charge that defendant Andre Benard had violated 18 U.S.C. §
25	922(g)(1). The parties requested that the Court relate the new case (CR 12-0780) to the earlier
26	case (CR 05-0400 SI). The Court granted that request.
27	The parties also requested a continuance of both cases to December 7, 2012, and
28	stipulated that the time should be excluded from the newly charged case, for effective preparation

1

CR 12-0780 SI

of counsel. The parties requested the continuance based on the need for the government to produce, and defense counsel to review, discovery, and on the need for defense counsel to assess the evidence in the new case to determine its impact on negotiations regarding a potential global resolution. In open court, the defendant agreed to a continuance through December 7, 2012, with a Speedy Trial Act exclusion.

The Court agreed that the requested continuance is appropriate, and that the period should be excluded from the otherwise applicable Speedy Trial Act computation, because failure to grant the continuance as requested would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

The Court now enters this Order to memorialize its ruling on November 2, 2012.

Based upon the parties' representations and the parties' agreement in open Court, THE COURT FINDS THAT the ends of justice served by granting a continuance from November 2, 2012 through and including December 7, 2012 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial, and that failure to grant such a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

Accordingly, THE COURT ORDERS THAT:

1. This case be continued from November 2, 2012 to December 7, 2012 at 11:00 a.m., and that the period from November 2, 2012 to December 7, 2012 be excluded from the otherwise applicable Speedy Trial Act computation, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) & (B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 12/11/2012

HON. SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

CR 12-0780 SI